

Remark

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application as amended.

Claims 29-31, 34-45, and 47-56 have been amended. Claims 1-28 have been previously canceled. Therefore, claims 29-56 are now presented for examination.

Claim Objections and Rejections

Claims 29, 38-39, 41-43, 49 and 51-56 were objected to for various informalities.

The Examiner's suggestions have been incorporated in the above amendments.

Shared Database

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the careful response to the After Final amendment and submits the present amendment and RCE after a careful review of the references and the Examiner's thorough final rejection.. In the last response, Applicant explained how none of the references show a shared database. The Examiner has rejected this distinction and found a shared database to be inherent in many of the references. While Applicant does not concede that the other references show a shared database as contemplated in the present application, the claims have been amended to rely more heavily on other features for patentability.

35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejection

Barber

The pending claims 29-32 and 36 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Barber et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,240,521 ("Barber"). Barber shows a conventional computer system with two processors coupled to a single I/O bus. In

Barber, two processors share "a common instruction set and address space." "Since the two processors share a common address space, the contents of memory is available equally to both processors. It is only the machine state which must be passed back and forth between the active processor via the shared memory and the sleep mode transitions." (Col. 3, lines 43 et seq.)

In other words, the processors share everything. While this reduces the component price for the system, it increases the power consumption. In Claim 29, there are two processors but the low-power subsystem has its own memory and external interface ("the low-power subsystem including a low power processor, an external interface and a low power memory"). These may be optimized for low power operation, while the memory and external interface of the "computer system" may be optimized for speed. This costs more than using the same components but it provides a longer battery life. The low-power subsystem only has to access the "computer system" when data located there is desired.

Claim 29 further recites "using the low power processor of the low power subsystem to access data contained within the computer system memory." This draws a clear distinction between the computer system memory and the low-power subsystem memory. Claim 29 further recites, "providing the accessed data through the external interface of the low-power subsystem." This operation is not possible with Barber as there is no separate external interface for the low-power processor.

The Examiner, with reference to Claim 38, has earlier suggested that Hollon, U.S. Patent No. 5,768,164 ("Hollon") shows a separate external interface for a low-power subsystem. However, in Hollon, there is no low-power subsystem. While, as noted by the Examiner, Hollon mentions power consumption as an issue in the Background

section, Hollon does not address the problem. Hollon uses a mini-display, and special function keys to provide access to the notebook computer when the lid is closed. In order to operate this system, at least the main CPU 81, main video controller 83, I/O controller 91 and keyboard controller 92 must all be operating. In addition, a special mini-display ASIC 84, and the mini-display must be operating. There is nothing in Hollon to suggest the first, second and third elements of Claim 29.

As to combining Hollon with Barber, Applicants submit, first that there are elements in Claim 29 that are simply not present in either reference (the low power memory, the separateness of the two memories, and the external interface being part of a low-power subsystem). In addition, there is no motivation within the references to make this combination. Barber reduces power through the processor but reuses all the other components. Hollon does not reduce power but simply provides an additional external display and buttons.

There is nothing in Hollon to suggest adding the Barber low-power processor to Hollon as cost and complexity would be increased and power is not an issue. (Adding a low-power subsystem to Hollon would not just increase the parts count, it would significantly increase complexity as the two systems and the connections between them would have to be developed.

Similarly, there is nothing in Barber to suggest adding a redundant memory and display from Hollon. Barber already has a power management function and if an additional display were to be added it would be coupled to the already common system bus just as it is in Hollon.

Accordingly, Claim 29 is believed to be allowable over Barber. Claims 30, 31, 32 and 36 contain similar limitations and are believed to be allowable therefor as well as for

any additional limitations set forth in each claim, respectively. These claims are not discussed separately in an effort to ease examination and Applicant does not concede any arguments or points raised by the Examiner in any prior action with respect to these and any other pending claims.

35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejection

Hollon

The pending claims 51-53 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Hollon, U.S. Patent No. 5,768,164 (“Hollon”). Hollon shows a notebook computer with a second user interface on the back of the display. The second user interface uses the same processor, memory, busses, etc as the primary user interface. Hollon has been described in detail above with respect to Claim 29. Notably absent from Hollon is the entire low-power subsystem including an additional memory, and an additional processor. The Examiner is referred to the above discussion as it pertain to these claims 51-53. Claims 51-53 contain limitations similar to those of Claim 29 and are believed to be allowable therefor as well as for any additional limitation set forth in each claim, respectively. These claims are not discussed separately in full in an effort to ease examination and Applicant does not concede any arguments or points raised by the Examiner in any prior action with respect to these and any other pending claims..

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejection

Barber and Hollon

The pending claims 38-40 42, 44 and 48-50 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Barber in view of Hollon. The combination of Barber

and Hollon is discussed above with respect to Claim 29. The Examiner is referred to the above discussion as it pertain to these claims as well. Claims 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 44 and 48-50 contain limitations similar to those of Claim 29 and are believed to be allowable therefor as well as for any additional limitation set forth in each claim, respectively.

These claims are not discussed separately in an effort to ease examination and Applicant does not concede any arguments or points raised by the Examiner in any prior action with respect to these and any other pending claims.

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejection

Barber, Hollon, and Kabelshkov

The pending claim 41 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Barber and Hollon, and further in view of Kabelshkov, U.S. Patent No. 6,108,663 (“Kabelshkov”). Claim 41 is dependent on Claim 38, which believed to be allowable for the reasons set forth above. Kabelshkov does not overcome the limitations of these two references. While Kableshkov shows that two processors can operate on a single database, this is done to increase speed and power consumption. There is nothing in Kabelshkov, nor in the other references to suggest using a shared database to support a low-power subsystem..

The Examiner is referred to the above discussion of Claim 29 as it pertain to Claim 41 as well. Claim 41 contains limitations similar to those of Claim 29 and is believed to be allowable therefor as well as for any additional limitation set forth therein. Claim 41 is not discussed separately in full detail in an effort to ease examination and Applicant does not concede any arguments or points raised by the Examiner in any prior action with respect to Claim 41 and any other pending claims..

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejection

Barber, Hollon, Ditzik, Chen

The remaining claims were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Barber and/or Hollon in combinations with Ditzik, U.S. Patent No. 5,983,073, (“Ditzik”) and Chen et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,590,197 (“Chen”). Neither Ditzik nor Chen were cited for the limitations discussed above with respect to Claim 29. The Examiner is referred to the above discussion as it pertain to these claims as well. These claims contain limitations similar to those of Claim 29 and are believed to be allowable therefor as well as for any additional limitations set forth in each claim, respectively. These claims are not discussed separately in an effort to ease examination and Applicant does not concede any arguments or points raised by the Examiner in any prior action with respect to these and any other pending claims..

Conclusion

Applicants respectfully submit that the rejections have been overcome by the amendment and remark, and that the claims as amended are now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the rejections be withdrawn and the claims as amended be allowed.

Invitation for a Telephone Interview

The Examiner is requested to call the undersigned at (303) 740-1980 if there remains any issue with allowance of the case.

Request for an Extension of Time

Applicants respectfully petition for an extension of time to respond to the outstanding Office Action pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) should one be necessary. Please charge our Deposit Account No. 02-2666 to cover the necessary fee under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17(a) for such an extension.

Charge our Deposit Account

Please charge any shortage to our Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: September 20, 2005



Gordon R. Lindeen III
Reg. No. 33,192

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
7th Floor
Los Angeles, California 90025-1030
(303) 740-1980